Guide for Review of Round II EZ Implementation Plans (IPs)			
Name of Program Participant:			
Staff Consulted:			
Goal Name:	Goal #:		
Category Name:	Category #:		
Plan Name:	Plan #:		
Name(s) of	Date		
Reviewer(s)			

NOTE: All questions that address requirements contain the citation for the source of the requirement (statute, regulation, NOFA, or grant agreement). If the requirement is not met, HUD must make a finding of noncompliance. All other questions (questions that do not contain the citation for the requirement) do not address requirements, but are included to assist the reviewer in understanding the participant's program more fully and/or to identify issues that, if not properly addressed, could result in deficient performance. Negative conclusions to these questions may result in a "concern" being raised, but not a **"finding."**

Instructions: This Exhibit is designed to evaluate the projects and programs documented in EZ's Implementation Plans (IPs) found in the Performance Measurement System (PERMS). Based upon the risk analysis process and pre-monitoring preparation, IPs should be chosen from each of the two IP goals, Economic Opportunity and Sustainable Community Development. (Note that Community-Based Partnership reviews are covered in Exhibit 14-1.) IP selections should cover as many of the Economic Opportunity and Sustainable Community Development categories (Workforce Development, Businesses Assisted, Access to Capital and Credit and Housing, Public Safety & Crime Prevention, Infrastructure, Environment, Health, Education, Human Services & Family Support, and Other Programs) as applicable and as time and resources permit. This Exhibit is divided into four sections: Funding/Contract Information; Resident Benefit; Financial Management; and Recordkeeping. A separate Exhibit is to be completed for each IP monitored.

Questions:

A. FUNDING/CONTRACT INFORMATION

a. Are HUD funds involved in this IP?		
	Yes	No
Describe Basis for Conclusion:		

14-1 09/2005

b. If the answer to "a" above is "yes," state the source of the HUD money and	the amo	unt.
Describe Basis for Conclusion:		
a. Is there a contract for this IP?		
	Yes	No
b. If the answer to "a" above is "yes," did the EZ comply with third party		
contract standards (per the Round II EZ Guidebook)?	Yes No	N/A
Describe Basis for Conclusion:		

09/2005 14-2

B. EZ RESIDENT BENEFIT

<u>Instructions</u>: The HUD Reviewer should randomly sample the addresses of at least 10 beneficiaries. If less than 10 beneficiaries are served, all addresses should be verified. The location of the addresses in the EZ can be verified by entering them into the HUD address locator at http://www.hud.gov/crlocator.

3.				
a.	. If there is a contract for this IP, does it specify the number of EZ residents to be served?	Yes	No	N/A
D	Describe Basis for Conclusion:			
b	. If the answer to "a" above is "yes," what is the number?			
D	Describe Basis for Conclusion:			
c.	. Is there documentation to show that the contractual goal was met?			
		Yes	No	N/A
D	Describe Basis for Conclusion:			
<u> </u>				
ا. a.	. Did the activity or activities in the EZ provide principal benefit to the EZ			
	residents?		Yes	No
D	Describe Basis for Conclusion:			

14-3 09/2005

	b. If the answer to "a" above is "no," did the EZ obtain a waiver for nonconforming expenditures as required?			
	noncomorning expenditures as required?	Yes	No	N/A
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:			
C.	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT			
5.				
	Does the EZ have accounting records to support the financial transactions for	r		
	this program or project and did the EZ comply with drawdown procedures? [Grant Agreement, Articles I.D, II, and III; 24 CFR 84.21 or 24 CFR Part 85]	201	Yes	No
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:	.20]		
6.				
0.	Do the expenditures shown in the Line of Credit Control System (LOCCS)		\Box	
	Budget Line Item for this IP appear reasonable in relation to progress as of the		Yes	No
	date of the review (e.g., not having a delay greater than 6 months or more than			
	50% of the projected outputs have not been achieved based on the proportion funds expended)?	of		
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:			

09/2005 14-4

7.			
	Do actual costs relate to activities and milestones described in the approved IP?		
		Yes	No
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:		
_			
<u>D.</u>	<u>RECORDKEEPING</u>		
8.			
	For the period reviewed, does the EZ's documentation match the performance		
	information reported in PERMS for progress?	Yes	No
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:		
0			
9.	To dear the E72 - de company to the management of the management o		
	For the period reviewed, does the EZ's documentation match the performance information reported in PERMS for Actions Benerted?		Ш
	information reported in PERMS for Actions Reported?	Yes	No
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:		
10.			
	Does the EZ's documentation match the performance information reported in		
	PERMS for eligibility of program or project funds?	Voc	L.
		Yes	No
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:		

14-5 09/2005

11.			
[OS] Does a visual inspection show that the EZ's documentation matches the			
performance information reported in PERMS for Activity Location?		Yes	No
Describe Basis for Conclusion:			
12			
If the IP claims to benefit residents, does the EZ's documentation match the			
information provided on the residents served as reported in PERMS?	Yes	No	N/A
Describe Basis for Conclusion:			

09/2005 14-6